

Committee on Resources

Testimony

Testimony
H. Alexander Wise, Jr., Virginia State Historic Preservation Officer, for
the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers on
H.R. 1522
October 21, 1997
U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Resources
Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands
The Honorable James Hansen, Chairman

The National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers appreciates the opportunity to testify on HR 1522, Amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act. We support strongly the reauthorization of deposits into the Historic Preservation Fund.

Expression of appreciation

First and foremost, the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers wishes to express its thanks to Representative Joel Hefley for introducing this bill which will benefit all the States, territories and District of Columbia by reauthorizing the annual deposits into the Historic Preservation Fund.

We appreciate Representative Hefley's on-going and continued support for historic preservation and heritage. We also express our gratitude to Mr. Hefley for his staff's interest in historic preservation, particularly the support of Larry Hojo. Mr. Hojo has taken the time to focus on historic preservation, not just in this Congress but throughout his tenure. A decade ago the Colorado State Historic Preservation Office staff told the National Conference staff how interested, knowledgeable and helpful Larry Hojo was in historic preservation. Since the introduction of HR 1522, he has made time to meet with preservationists to discuss this bill in depth. We wish to go on record in expressing our appreciation for the interest and support of both Representative Hefley and Mr. Hojo.

Role of the State Historic Preservation Officers

The State Historic Preservation Officers are the individuals who take the language of the statute and make it real on the ground.⁽¹⁾ The State Historic Preservation Officers carry out the act and deliver the national historic preservation program to American citizens.

The federal government --National Park Service, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation--sets the standards and writes the regulations while the States do the work.

Therefore, any changes to the National Historic Preservation Act affect the States (and tribal preservation offices)⁽²⁾ most directly. Since this bill will affect States' daily operations and since State Historic Preservation Officers were not involved in the original drafting, we are appreciative of the Subcommittee's invitation to testify.

Background: the American Preservation Team

From the beginning in 1966 when the Preservation Act was first passed, the National Park Service had determined to implement this initiative by establishing a relationship with the States. The Director wrote

each Governor and asked the States to participate. Luckily, each Governor not only said "yes," but also agreed to pay half the cost of this federal program.

This 30-year old relationship is more than a partnership; it is a team effort. Just as you couldn't field a baseball team with only 2 players, the nation could not have a historic preservation program without the States. The National Park Service and the Council could not do it alone.

Overview of HR 1522

The National Conference supports and urges the adoption of the reauthorization of the deposits into the Historic Preservation Fund.

The National Conference believes the Subcommittee should take a close look at the remaining provisions of HR 1522 both as a matter of national policy and for timeliness. As we indicate below we believe this bill, originally drafted during the 104th Congress, shoots at targets that have subsequently moved. Further, States' federal team members have not yet completed implementation of the 1992 Amendments to the Act, nor the 1994 improvements to the program adopted by the Secretary's National Park System Advisory Board.⁽³⁾ We believe finishing these tasks has a higher priority than new initiatives or legislative fine tuning.

Section-by-section review of HR 1522

The following section-by-section analysis of HR 1522 includes the views of the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers.

National Historic Preservation Act Amendments, HR 1522, Rep. Joel Hefley (CO), May 1, 1997

Text and NCSHPO views Changes reflected in the Act⁽⁴⁾

HR 1522, Section 1, Paragraph (1) Add the following text at the end of section 101(a)(1)(B): "Any National Historic Landmark Districts for which the Secretary has not published boundaries in the Federal Register by January 1, 2007, shall be removed from the National Register of Historic Places."

Comment: This section micro manages National Park Service activities. We do not know of any problems created by the slow pace of finalizing the boundary effort.

The National Conference believes complying with this provision would draw limited Park Service staff time away from priority activities, including work with State Historic Preservation Offices.

(a)(1) (A) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to expand and maintain a National Register. . .

(B). . . All historic properties listed in the Federal Register of February 6, 1979, as "National Historic Landmarks" . . . are declared by Congress to be National Historic Landmarks . . . except that in cases of National Historic Landmark districts for which no boundaries have been established, boundaries must first be published in the Federal Register. "Any National Historic Landmark Districts for which the Secretary has not published boundaries in the Federal Register by January 1, 2007, shall be removed from the National Register of Historic Places."

(2) By striking the third sentence of section 101(a)(6).

Comment: The National Conference, including during discussions (1985-92) about the 1992 Amendments, supported and continues to support the role of private property owners in the National Register nomination process.

The deletion of this sentence may limit the Secretary's options in National Register decisions.

(6) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations requiring that . . . , the owner or owners . . . shall be given the opportunity (including a

reasonable period of time) to concur in, or object to, the nomination of the property . . . If the owner or owners . . . , object to such inclusion or designation, such property shall not be included on the National Register or designated as a National Historic Landmark until such objection is withdrawn. ~~The Secretary shall review the nomination of the property or district where any such objection has been made and shall determine whether or not the property or district is eligible for such inclusion or designation, and if the Secretary determines that such property or district is eligible for such inclusion or designation, he shall inform the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer, the appropriate chief elected local official and the owner or owners of such property, of his determination.~~ The regulations under this paragraph shall include provisions to carry out the purposes of this paragraph in the case of multiple ownership of a single property.

(3) Section 101(e)(2) is repealed.

Comment: The National Conference accedes to the position of the National Trust on the removal of this section.

(e) (1) The Secretary shall administer a program of matching grants to the States for the purposes of carrying out this Act.

~~(2) The Secretary shall administer a program of matching grants in aid to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, chartered by Act of Congress approved October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 947), for the purposes of carrying out the responsibilities of the National Trust.~~

(4) Section 101(g) is amended to read as follows:

"(g)The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation shall promulgate guidelines for Federal agency responsibilities under section 110 of this title."

Comment: This is the first of several sections which transfer certain preservation authorities from the National Park Service to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Since the Council is currently understaffed to meet its existing responsibilities, the transfer of responsibilities without adequate re-sources to carry them out means some area of Council activity will have to be dropped to accomplish new responsibilities.

Further, since the National Park Service has already issued the Guidelines, the provision is less timely than when introduced.

Sec. 101(g) ~~In consultation with~~ The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, ~~the Secretary~~ shall promulgate guidelines for Federal agency responsibilities under section 110 of this title.

(5) Section 103 is amended by adding the following new subsection.

"(e) The State shall be solely responsible for determining which professional employees (in accordance with section 112), are necessary to carry out the duties of the State."

Comment: Initially, this provision resulted from an informal conversation between Wilson Martin, Utah Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, and National Park Service Subcommittee staff during the 104th Congress. Since that time the National Park Service has issued professional qualifications standards, in consultation with State Historic Preservation Officers (the sole body upon which the standards are binding). The current draft standards address State Historic Preservation Officer concerns including those of Utah. This provision is now out of date.

Sec. 103 (c) A minimum of 10 per centum of the annual apportionment . . . shall be transferred by the State, pursuant to the requirements of this Act, to local governments which are certified under section 101 (c). . . .

(d) The Secretary shall establish guidelines for the use . . . of funds under subsection (c). . . .

(e) The State shall be solely responsible for determining which professional employees (in accordance with section 112), are necessary to carry out the duties of the State."

(6) Section 107 is repealed.

Comment: As government officials, State Historic Preservation Officers believe that it is impractical to delete this provision and require the Administration, the Congress and the Supreme Court to consult with the District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Officer on undertakings.

The public interest in these properties provides a far stronger protection than exists in Section 106.

~~Sec. 107 Nothing in this act shall be construed to be applicable to the White House and its grounds, the Supreme Court building and its grounds, or the United States Capitol and its related buildings and grounds.~~

(7) Section 108 is amended by striking "1997" and inserting "2002".

Comment: The National Conference fully supports and urges the enactment of the reauthorization of deposits from the revenues from off shore oil leases in to the Fund.

We would prefer a 10 year authorization, we believe the 30-year successful track record supports a longer period.

Sec. 108 To carry out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby established the Historic Preservation Fund.

There shall be covered into the fund. . . \$150,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1982 through ~~1997~~ 2002. . . .

(8) Section 110(a)(1) is amended by inserting the following before the period at the end of the second sentence:

", especially those located in central business areas. When locating Federal facilities, Federal agencies shall give first consideration to historic properties in historic districts. If no such property is suitable, then Federal agencies shall consider other developed or undeveloped sites within historic districts, if no suitable site within a district exists. Any rehabilitation or construction that is undertaken pursuant to this Act must be architecturally compatible with the character of the surrounding historic district or properties."

Comment: This provision takes the President's Executive Order and makes it part of the statute which may result in strengthening its implementation. Success will depend most on actions of federal agencies such as the General Services Administration.

Sec 110 (a)(1) The heads of all Federal agencies shall assume responsibility for the preservation of historic properties which are owned or controlled by such agency. Prior to acquiring, constructing, or leasing buildings for purposes of carrying out agency responsibilities, each Federal agency shall use, to the maximum extent feasible, historic properties available to the agency, especially those located in central business areas. When locating Federal facilities, Federal agencies shall give first consideration to historic properties in historic districts. If no such property is suitable, then Federal agencies shall consider other developed or undeveloped sites within historic districts, if no suitable site within a district exists. Any rehabilitation or construction that is undertaken pursuant to this Act must be architecturally compatible with the character of the surrounding historic district or properties.. Each agency shall undertake, consistent with the preservation of such properties and the mission of the agency and the professional standards established pursuant to section 101(g), any preservation, as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(9) Section 110(b) is amended by inserting a period after the phrase "appropriate agency" and striking the remainder of the subsection.

Comment: This provision has the effect of editorial streamlining, but does not indicate who will determine what "such other appropriate agency" might be.

Sec 110(b) Each Federal agency shall initiate measures to assure that where, as a result of Federal action or assistance carried out by such agency, an historic property is to be substantially altered or demolished, timely steps are taken to make or have made

appropriate records, and that such records then be deposited, in accordance with section 101(a), in the Library of Congress or with such other appropriate agency. ~~as may be designated by the Secretary, for future use and reference.~~

(10) Section 110(e) is repealed.

Comment: Since the transfer of federal property constitutes an undertaking under Section 106 of the Act, Secretarial review may be redundant.

~~(e) The Secretary shall review and approve the plans of transferees of surplus federally owned historic properties not later than ninety days after his receipt of such plans to ensure that the prehistorical, historical, architectural, or culturally significant values will be preserved or enhanced.~~

(11) Section (h) of section 110 is amended by striking "The Secretary" and inserting "The Council" and by redesignating such subsection as section 215.

Comment: The Council has made historic preservation awards, while the Secretary has not. This is an example of statutory provisions never implemented by the Secretary. (See Section 104 of the Act.)

Sec. 215 The Council ~~(h) The Secretary~~ shall establish an annual preservation awards program under which he may make monetary awards . . . and provide citations for special achievements to officers and employees of Federal, State, and certified local governments in recognition of their outstanding contributions. . . .

(12) Subsection (j) of section 110 is amended by striking "The Secretary" and inserting "The Council" and by redesignating such subsection as section 216.

Comment: The NCSHPO believes this change is not necessary and the renumbering of the text ("this section") makes its meaning unclear.

Sec 216. The Council ~~(j) The Secretary~~ shall promulgate regulations under which the requirements of *this section* [emphasis added] may be waived in whole or in part in the event of a major natural disaster or an imminent threat to the national security.

(13) Title II is amended by adding the following new section after Section 216: "Sec. 217. dispute Resolution.

"Whenever a disagreement arises between two or more Federal agencies, or between a State or a political sub-division thereof and one or more Federal agencies, or between a project applicant and any level of government concerning an undertaking and such disagreement is referred to the Council by one or more of the parties involved in that disagreement, the Council is authorized to take appropriate action to resolve such disagreement."

Comment: The State Historic Preservation Officers have experienced the Council's ability to resolve conflicts among federal agencies. We are not sure if this language materially increases the Council's authorities in working with federal agencies.

The National Conference questions the appropriateness of giving authority to the Council to insert itself in disputes outside of the federal government in State or local government or private sector concerns.

(15) Paragraph (7) of section 301 is amended by inserting "with potential to affect historic resources" immediately after the word "program".

Comment: This addition of text to the Act, while reflected in the intent of the Council's regulations (36 CFR Part 800) limits the Council's flexibility to adjust its regulations at a future date.

(7) "Undertaking" means a project, activity, or program with potential to affect historic resources funded in whole or in part under the direct or indirect jurisdiction of a Federal agency, including--

(A) those carried out by or on behalf of the agency; . . .

Background on the Historic Preservation Fund

Congress established the Historic Preservation Fund in 1976, modeled on the Land and Water Conservation Fund (16 USC 460).

The Historic Preservation Fund, like the Land and Water Fund, is based on the idea that a part of proceeds from depletion of a non-renewable resource--off shore gas and oil leases--should be invested in the enhancement of other non-renewable resources: historic properties. The Historic Preservation Fund account supports roughly half the cost of the Nation's historic preservation program as created by the National Historic Preservation Act. (States and other non-federal sources pay the rest of the costs.)

Of the roughly \$3 billion annual revenues from off shore leasing, \$150,000,000 was deposited annually into the Historic Preservation Fund.

The National Conference wishes that Congress continue the authorization through an amendment of Section 108 of the National Historic Preservation Act changing the termination date of the authorization from 1997 to 2007.

Success Stories of the National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 is a major turning point in the story of historic preservation in America. Most scholars agree that historic preservation began in the 1850's with the efforts of Ann Pamela Cunningham to save Mount Vernon. When Congress would not act, Miss Cunningham founded the Mount Vernon Ladies Association of the Union, raised the money and bought the property. Other prominent dates in historic preservation include the founding of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities and the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities in the 1890's. In the 20th century the federal government showed its commitment to history through the Antiquities Act and the Historic Sites Act. Other than local government efforts to establish historic ordinances (Charleston, SC, 1930's), historic preservation activity focused on acquisition of threatened property which was opened to the public.

The National Historic Preservation Act marks a dramatic change in preservation. The focus changed from ownership and perpetual maintenance to making historic preservation a part of the federal government's planning process. The Act emphasizes the role of historic places in our daily lives and the benefits to all Americans of continuing to use and enjoy our heritage. The goal is not to create museums but to accommodate history within modern life.

The Act established a process for the federal and State governments to accomplish the planning and assistance objectives of the Act through

1. the identification, description and location of historic places,
2. the recognition of historic significance in the National Register,
3. federal agency acknowledgment of heritage and consideration of historic values in project planning and
4. the reliance on and acknowledgment of the seminal role of the private sector voluntarily funding the conservation of historic places.

Inventory: States supported by the Historic Preservation Fund, matched from non-federal sources, have located approximately 5,641,000 archeological sites, buildings, structures and objects associated with their

history. This phenomenal archive provides information on individual places for scholarship about America's history. More importantly, this data is consulted on a daily basis by federal agencies and applicants for federal assistance in project planning. The Bureau of Land Management has acknowledged the importance of this data in their planning and is working with western States to provide direct, on-line access.

Research on places from the State's past has resulted in an enlarged understanding of local history. Southern States' work on African American history has led to the formation of African American heritage councils of which Georgia's Minority Historic Preservation Committee was one of the first. In 1984 the SHPOffice published Carole Merritt's *Black Historic Resources A Handbook for the Identification, Documentation, and Evaluation of Historic African-American Properties in Georgia*.

"Five Views: An Ethnic Sites Survey for California" was a prototype study of the places important in the history of Indian, African, Chinese, Japanese and Mexican ancestry.

North Carolina has maintained a 30-year program of popular publications of the results of historic site surveys culminating in Catherine Bisher and Tim Buchman's award winning publication *North Carolina Architecture* (Chapel Hill, 1990).

Interest in local traditions led to the creation of the Vernacular Architecture Forum, a national organization of scholars drawn in large measure from State Historic Preservation Offices.

Pennsylvania used the data in its inventories as the basis for historical publications that provided the background for the very successful State program of heritage parks using historical places as a part of a cultural tourism/economic development strategy.

National Register: The success of the National Register over 30-years has resulted in the listing of 67,903 properties which, when adding individual properties within historic districts, comes to 1,038,354 (a fraction of one per cent of all the nation's buildings). Register listing has initiated countless of private sector historic preservation efforts across the country.

Significant sites from the 20th century have been recognized on the National Register from the historic aircraft nominations in Alaska to Cape Canaveral in Florida.

National Register listing brought needed national recognition to buildings and districts helping private citizens' preservation efforts. One of the first efforts was College Hill Historic District in Providence, Rhode Island. A National Historic Landmark/National Register listing in 1970 helped local preservationists led by Antoinette Downing convince skeptical city leaders to retain the then deteriorating neighborhood. The Old Market in Omaha, Nebraska, is one example of dedicated preservationists seeing the benefits of a run-down warehouse district and turning it into a thriving neighborhood and major tourist attraction.

Section 106 consultation: Federal agencies' involvement in considering our heritage as first set out in Section 106 of the Act has resulted in the preservation of thousands of historic places. The Fell's Point Historic District in Baltimore, Maryland, now a thriving community and tourist attraction, was threatened with demolition for an interstate highway.

In Chicago, Section 106 review of a federal project that threatened the demolition of the Yondorf Block and Hall, a community center for immigrants on the North Side, resulted in a relocation of the federal project and a \$3 million rehabilitation of the building by a private developer.

A Farmers Home Administration foreclosure triggered Section 106 review which led to the discovery of the Jaketown Archeological Site in Belzoni, Mississippi, an elaborate assemblage of mounds dating to 2,000 B. C., now a National Historic Landmark.

Tax credit: The rehabilitation tax credit, like the HPF dating to 1976, stimulated \$757,000,000 in private sector investment in rehabilitation for income producing activities in the last fiscal year. The National Park Service summarized the 19 years of accomplishment as follows.⁽⁵⁾

Number of historic rehabilitation projects certified by the NPS 27,064

Private sector investment leveraged \$17.93 billion

Housing units rehabilitated 142,916

Low and moderate income housing units created 33,011

Washingtonians know one of the biggest rehab tax credit successes, Union Station. On the west coast, Washingtonians in Spokane watched the preservation tax credit rehabilitate apartment houses in Browne's Addition National Register Historic District for low and moderate income housing.

In the late 1970's when the Historic Preservation Fund withdrawals reached \$60 million, State Historic Preservation Officers participated directly in restoration projects. Except for the Jobs Bill of 1983 which provided a specific appropriation for restoration, the withdrawals have not allowed for restoration grants. From the Botetourt County Courthouse in Fincastle, Virginia, to Fort Bridger, Wyoming, to the Kimball House in Central City, Colorado, the Historic Preservation Fund provided the seed funding and the professional standards for restoration projects.

SHPOs, without restoration grants, have focused on affecting historic preservation outcomes through building alliances with the general public and local and State government planning processes. Most States publish a newsletter that disseminates information about activities and technical advances to a general audience; conduct technical training work-shops (Ohio's House Doctor program is one of the longest running); and hold annual conferences often in partnership with private, non-profit organizations.

Through Certified Local Governments and the Section 106 process, State Historic Preservation Officers have become participants in planning at the State and local levels. In Anne Arundel County, Maryland, for example, information on archeological sites is routinely considered by the County in reviewing subdivision applications. States' historic site inventories, once digitized in a geographic information systems format, become a factor in long range planning.

Unfinished Agenda

The thirty years of success of the National Historic Preservation Act and the State Historic Preservation Offices evokes an image, not of a task completed, but of work yet to be done. State Historic Preservation Offices have a responsibility to respond to the demand activities from the public and federal agencies. The for-profit private sector expects the State Historic Preservation Office to assist on the certified rehabilitation of historic properties. Federal agencies look to the State Historic Preservation Office to consult on projects that may affect historic properties. No other agency exists to stand in for the States, not the National Park Service, not the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

The goals of the 1966 Act are not achieved.⁽⁶⁾ Limited withdrawals from the Historic Preservation Fund since 1980 slowed the pace and focused States' attention on demand function. Owners across the country continue to push for nominations to the National Register. Few States, with the notable exception of Rhode Island, have completed their inventories; they lack a comprehensive picture of the resources within their boundaries. Further, the up-grading of the data from paper records to computer data bases and geographic information systems proceeds far behind the pace of technological development. Discussions are currently underway among the States and with federal agencies, particularly the National Park Service and the Bureaus of Land Management and Reclamation, on cooperative efforts to accelerate the pace of digitizing

information and providing on-line access to agency and industry users.

Local governments continue to be interested in partnership with the States in the national preservation program. Assistance from State Historic Preservation Offices is essential in initiating efforts and in maintaining local government programs. Information and data from State Historic Preservation Offices continues to be important to citizens and local governments in considering alternatives for their future.

Further, as time passes, properties become older, who will consider the question, "Are they historic?" State Historic Preservation Offices are now involved with that question working with local citizens and agencies on the significance of properties from the Cold War and the Fifties. When the Act was passed in 1966, properties from World War I had not been around for 50 years. During those three decades property types such as the elaborate movie houses of the 1920's have become "historic."

Finally, the millennium is approaching. State Historic Preservation Officers are considering 20th century legacies. What treasures speak of the achievements of our century? What steps will this generation take to leave our legacy in good condition for the future? The National Conference hopes that the Historic Preservation Fund will participate meaningfully toward legacy restoration.

Conclusion

The National Conference thanks Chairman Hansen and Mr. Hefley for holding this hearing. We appreciate the opportunity to inform the Subcommittee of the benefits of the historic preservation program launched here 30 years ago.

We strongly support the reauthorization of deposits into the Historic Preservation Fund.

In terms of HR 1522, the National Conference supports the passage of the following paragraphs in Section 1.

(7) Reauthorization of deposits into the Historic Preservation Fund

(8) Statutory requirement for government agencies to locate in historic downtowns

(10) Elimination of Secretarial review of transfers of federal property

We thank the Resources Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands for their consideration of our views.

1. In 1980 local governments were added as partners to the States in implementing the Act. In 1992, tribes received the option of implementing the preservation program on their reservations.

2. While the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers supports the voluntary establishment of tribal preservation offices on reservations, the National Conference is focusing its testimony on the States. Tribal preservation officers speak for themselves.

3. National Park System Advisory Board, *National Performance Review of the Historic Preservation Fund Partnerships*, March 6, 1994, Washington, DC.

4. The existing text of the Act is in sans serif type; additions are in serif type.

5. Heritage Preservation Services Program, National Center for Cultural Resource Stewardship and Partnerships, National Park Service, "Federal Tax Incentives for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, Fiscal Year 1996 Report and Analysis," 1977.

6. Although a major need exists to assist interested Indian tribes in becoming part of the national historic preservation program and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers supports the creation of tribal preservation offices, this testimony focuses on the States.

1. Two decades of success of HPF
2. Program tested over 30 years
3. Pathfinder in new way of doing business
 1. State- Federal intergovernmental cooperation
 2. States pay half the cost of the federal program
 3. Voluntary participation for private sector
 4. Federal government participation mandatory
4. Philosophy still valid
 1. Use part of the proceeds (OCS revenues FY 96 \$x) from the depletion of one non renewable natural resource, oil, for the conservation of other non-renewable resources: historic properties
5. Historic preservation program generates development and recycling simultaneously
6. Historic preservation program tempers federal agencies to think about the nation's heritage before destroying it
7. Historic preservation program acknowledges and celebrates the an individual's favorite piece of American history
8. Historic preservation program lets us learn about our predecessors through the legacy they left on the land from Mount Vernon to the desert ruts of the Oregon Trail to the Cape Canaveral launch pad

to secure a productive future for America's historic places look before you leap; measure twice cut once recycling means reusing neighborhoods and downtowns having a wilderness in America's future means recycling neighborhoods and downtowns historic preservation makes economic sense waste not want not: waste not America's neighborhoods and downtowns If it ain't broke, don't fix it. Many hands make light work. pull together "The [historic preservation] partnership has preserved thousands of cultural resources, enhanced the quality of life in communities through out the nation, revitalized countless historic districts, contributed educational and tourism opportunities, and through the preservation tax incentives, provided sustainable housing in humane environments. Participating in the partnership first as State Historic Preservation Officer for Indiana and now as Director of the National Park Service, I have observed firsthand its ability to enlist the energy of the private sector and the democracy of local government in pursuit of State and national goals. "In this anniversary, there is room for pride an there is room for improvement. As we celebrate, let us recognize our achievements and dedicate ourselves to tasks ahead. I have heart it said that our nation's natural and cultural resources are both inherited from our ancestors and borrowed from our children. If we are to live up to the obligations implicit in that observation, we must make even more remarkable achievements in the next quarter century." James M. Ridenour, Director, National Park Service in *Held in Trust: Preserving America's Historic Places The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 25th Anniversary Report*, Forward, National Park Service, 1991 "As Americans our heritage is a unique treasure--it doesn't really belong to us--we merely hold it in trust--then pass it along to the next generation. Over the years we add to this history, but then it belongs to the future." Manuel Lujan, Jr., Secretary, Department of the Interior, proclamation for National Historic Preservation Week, May 13, 1991 The right of cities to be beautiful. (1954 Berman v. Parker, US Supreme Court) noble sentiments and a positive cash flow "As the population grows and urban sprawl increases, preservationists are becoming acutely aware of the need for space and proper surroundings." Walter Muir Whitehill, *With Heritage So Rich*, Preservation Press, 1983, page 153 1966 "We must preserve and we must preserve wisely. As the report emphasizes, in its best sense preservation does not mean merely the setting aside of thousands of buildings as museum pieces. It means retaining the culturally valuable structures as useful objects: a home in which human beings live, a building in the service of some commercial or community purpose. Such preservation insures structural integrity, relates the preserved object to the life of the people around it, and, not least, it makes preservation a source of positive financial gain rather than another expense." Lady Bird Johnson, *With Heritage So Rich*, page 17 -

###